

| | | | |
|--------------------------|--------------------------------------|--------------------------------------|--|
| Interview Summary | Application No. 09/595,096 | Applicant(s) DILLER ET AL. | |
| | Examiner Marjorie A. Moran | Art Unit 1631 | |
| | | | |

All participants (applicant, applicant's representative, PTO personnel):

- (1) Marjorie A. Moran. (3) _____
 (2) Tom Arnold. (4) _____

Date of Interview: 02 February 0305.

Type: a) ☐ Telephonic b) ☐ Video Conference
 c) ☒ Personal [copy given to: 1) ☐ applicant 2) ☒ applicant's representative]

Exhibit shown or demonstration conducted: d) ☐ Yes e) ☒ No.
 If Yes, brief description: _____

Claim(s) discussed: All pending.

Identification of prior art discussed: None

Agreement with respect to the claims f) ☐ was reached. g) ☐ was not reached. h) ☒ N/A.

Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments: _____

(A fuller description, if necessary, and a copy of the amendments which the examiner agreed would render the claims allowable, if available, must be attached. Also, where no copy of the amendments that would render the claims allowable is available, a summary thereof must be attached.)

THE FORMAL WRITTEN REPLY TO THE LAST OFFICE ACTION MUST INCLUDE THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. (See MPEP Section 713.04). If a reply to the last Office action has already been filed, APPLICANT IS GIVEN ONE MONTH FROM THIS INTERVIEW DATE, OR THE MAILING DATE OF THIS INTERVIEW SUMMARY FORM, WHICHEVER IS LATER, TO FILE A STATEMENT OF THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. See Summary of Record of Interview requirements on reverse side or on attached sheet.

The attorney stated that claims 11-20 are cancelled in an amendment recently filed. The exmr said that upon cancellation of these claims, the rejection under 35 USC 101 would be withdrawn. There was an extended discussion about utility and statutory considerations. The atny pointed to the background (pages 2-3) for utility of a "docking method." The exmr stated that this MAY be sufficient, or that a similar utility MAY be established in the prior art for a docking method, depending on the actual claimed result of the method.

Examiner Note: You must sign this form unless it is an Attachment to a signed Office action.

Marjorie A. Moran
 Examiner's signature, if required